

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, in light of the preceding amendments and following remarks, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-8 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, the specification and claims 1-8 are amended. The amendments are for non-narrowing purpose, and related only to correct formality issues. No new matter is added. Claim 1 is the sole independent claim.

Applicants note with appreciation the Examiner's acknowledgement that certified copies of all priority documents have been received by the U.S.P.T.O.

Applicants also appreciate the Examiner's indication that the Information Disclosure Statement filed on July 21, 2005, has been considered.

Objections to the Drawings

The drawings are objected to because FIGS. 1 and 2 do not contain a legend.

Applicants respectfully submit that a legend is not required, and accordingly submit that the instant disclosure adequately identifies and describes the elements depicted in FIGS. 1 and 2. For example, the instant disclosure describes that "SC" corresponds to a security module, "STB" corresponds to a decoder, " M1 and M2" correspond to a memory, "MC" corresponds to a processing unit, "UA" corresponds to a unique number, "BCS" corresponds to data blocks, and "CGS" corresponds to a management center.

Accordingly, in view of the above, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection to the drawings.

Objections to the Specification

The disclosure is objected to because of informalities. Accordingly, Applicants have included appropriate section headings in the instant disclosure. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent No. 5,774,546 (hereinafter, "Handelman"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for the reasons discussed below.

Applicants respectfully submit that the Handelman reference fails to disclose or suggest each and every element of claim 1, and therefore, an anticipatory rejection has not been established.¹

For example, claim 1, as amended, recites, a method of storing and transmitting information, comprising, *inter alia*:

determining the specific information contained in the first security module intended for transmission,

transferring the specific information into the user unit,

storing the specific information in the user unit,

replacing the first security module by the second security module,

connecting the user unit on a transmission network,

initializing a transfer of information between the second security module and a management center, and

¹ A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. See MPEP Sec. 2131; *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2D 628, 631, 2 USPQ 2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir.1987).

inserting the user unit, of a data block in the blocks transmitted by the second security module, the data block including the identifier of the first security module and the data specific to the first security module.

In particular, Applicants respectfully submit that the Handelman reference fails to disclose or suggest, "transferring the specific information into the user unit," as recited in amended claim 1.

Col. 3, lines 40-45 of the Handelman reference discloses:

In a preferred embodiment of the invention billing data is also kept in the main card. In that case the main card retains billing data of programs which are not restricted for viewing under parental control as well as billing data of programs which are restricted for viewing under parental control....

Moreover, col. 3, line 61 – col. 4, lines 29 of the Handelman reference discloses:

Preferably, the main card at a subscriber location may be frequently replaced while the parent card is seldom replaced. In that case all entitlements and billing data remaining in the main card since last report to a billing facility may be transmitted to the parent card prior to replacement of the main card. When the subscriber receives a new main card and places it in card receptacle 24, the parent card automatically starts an initialization algorithm which employs two way communication between the parent card and the new main card to provide authentication, verification, validation or a combination thereof of the main card.

In other words, the billing data of the Handelman reference are transferred from the main card to the parental card before replacing the main card. When the new main card is inserted into the decoder slot, the initialization data contained in the parental card are transferred into the new main card. At the same time, the billing data is also transferred into the new main card. Accordingly, the Handelman reference fails to disclose, or even suggest, "transferring the specific information into the user unit," since the Handelman reference teaches that the information is transferred into the parental card.

In addition, Applicants respectfully submit that the Handelman reference also fails to disclose or suggest, "inserting the user unit, of a data block in the blocks transmitted by the second security module, the data block including the identifier of the first security module and the data specific to the first security module," as recited in amended claim 1.

In contrast, the Handelman reference discloses that the specific data are passed from the old main card to the new main card, and in no way sent by the user unit while specific data of the new main card are sent to the management center.

Even assuming that the parental card could be understood as the "user unit" (in which Applicants do not agree or admit to), it would still not read on the claimed invention because there is no disclosure that the specific data is transferred to the user unit (parental card). That is, there is nothing in the Handelman reference which discloses that the parental card will transfer the specific data of the old main card while the specific data of the new main card are transmitted to the management center.

Therefore, contrary to the Examiner's contention, the Handelman reference does not disclose or suggest each and every element of claim 1.

Since the Handelman reference fails to disclose each and every element of claim 1, it cannot provide a basis for a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and, thus, is allowable. Claims 2-8 depend from amended claim 1 and, therefore, allowable for the similar reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1.

For at least these reasons, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the § 102(b) rejection of claims 1-8.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above remarks and amendments, Applicants respectfully submit that each of the pending objections and rejections has been addressed and overcome, placing the present application in condition for allowance. A notice to that effect is respectfully requested. Further, the above remarks demonstrate the failings of the outstanding rejections, and are sufficient to overcome the rejections. However, these remarks are not intended to, nor need they, comprehensively address each and every reason for the patentability of the claimed subject matter over the applied prior art. Accordingly, Applicants do not contend that the claims are patentable solely on the basis of the particular claim elements discussed above.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned, at the telephone number below.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 08-0750 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

HARNESS, DICKEY, & PIERCE, P.L.C.

By


John A. Castellano, Reg. No. 35,094

P.O. Box 8910
Reston, Virginia 20195
(703) 668-8000

JAC/DJC:aem